THE UNITARIAN.

VOL. I. MAY 1, 1834. No. 5.

True and False Zeal.

WE hear much said of the coldness of New-England preaching, and the March number of THE UNITARIAN contains a letter on the subject, to which we would ask the attention of those who have not read it. But *Unitarian* preaching is usually singled out as the special mark for this reproach of coldness and want of zeal. Unitarianism itself is attacked, while the lifeless exposition, which it is said to receive at the hands of its ministers, is pretendedly traced to its efficient causes. The system itself is said to be dead and heartless, and we are told there is no wonder it should in its exhibition appear as it is, corpse-like and cold. We shall not stop to consider this strain of self-refuting taunt which is so often rung in our ears, but shall make it the occasion of some remarks upon zeal in general, leaving others to draw their own conclusions.

Paul tells us "it is good to be zealously affected in a good thing," and, as we make no question that Christianity is a *good thing*, it becomes all, who acknowledge its truth, to promote its spread. Now to be zealously affected in the work evidently is to engage in it with earnestness and ardour. So far, doubtless, all would agree. But there may be difference of opinion as to the true meaning of this earnestness and ardour. In a given case one man might affirm its existence while another should assert its absence. And we apprehend that to be a great and hurtful error which regards true zeal in religion as inconsistent with calmness, thus establishing an opposition between feeling and reason, and making our nature a kingdom divided against itself. Perhaps some have even thought it necessary to beware of having too much feeling, lest it

should despoil them of calm and sober rationality, — as if calmness were not thoroughly consistent with the most intense emotion, and as if feeling were to be narrowed down in its meaning to the mere foam of extravagance and the ravings of insanity, to groans and shrieks, to tossings of the arms, and writhings of the body, — as if, in short, that true zeal which a Christian preacher should seek were made up, half of excited passion, and half of mere physical action. Now we undertake to say not only that these exhibitions are not the sole evidence of just and strong feeling, but that they do not betoken the most powerful emotion. Indeed, they are often signs of a mere childish weakness and weeping and imbecility. Nay, they may be found in connexion with coldness of heart, and are as consistent with deadness and want of motion and warmth in its real living depths, as all the anger and ostentation and fury of the frothy billows are with the cold, dead, motionless rocks around which they break. The heart may stand out hard and immovable while all this excitement of the outer man rages and dashes about it. What a freezing effect must be produced, in such a case, upon those who actually perceive the excitement to be artificial! But take those who have not a doubt as to the real earnestness and sincerity of the speaker, — how and to what degree are they excited at such times? With all their confidence in the preacher, their excitement must, in a great measure, be like his. They may mistake their physical agitation for a deep movement of the soul; they may think their groans extorted when they unconsciously, but really, take pains to utter them; they may not distinguish the shriek of nervous hysteric pain from that which comes from agony of spirit. But effects must correspond to their causes. It is not every tone that, being indeed a tone of feeling, goes to the living heart of the hearer and regulates its motions; it is not a flinging of the arms at random that can express or convey a resistless energy of love and holy purpose. Emotions must strongly act on the inner man before they can appear in their own strong natural language in the countenance; and when the occasion is a real occasion, when the object is, and is understood to be, to excite men to action and effort of mind and life, and not to furnish them with a luxurious enjoyment of mere tragical scenes, strong feeling must exist in the soul of the speaker before it can be conveyed to the soul of the hearer. The preacher may desire to express an unfathomable love or joy or grief, but these must be seen to be unfathomable

before the great assembly can sympathize with them by the experience of emotions alike unbounded.

It is said of the zeal of which we have been speaking, that, however blameworthy it may be on account of its excesses, it is not at all liable to the charge of coldness. If that zeal be entitled to the praise of a warm and animating zeal, which rouses the tumultuous passions of the soul, which mingles the deep tide of human desires and hopes in furious commotion, the remark may be true. But there is a zeal — let each man judge for himself where it is exhibited — which is hot and consuming, rather than cheering and vivifying to the noblest powers and affections of the soul. It is a flame that rages like the fire in autumnal woods, laying waste everything fair and glorious within its reach, and leaving what was just now so bright and beautiful to coldness and darkness and desolation. As in the case of the forest-conflagration, the sun with his calm yet powerful light and heat must toil days and months with a steady patience to bring back the green and smiling beauty of the landscape, so must the power of a calm and equable zeal shed its choicest influence on the soul ere she can regain the beauty that has been marred, and be clothed anew in the verdure that has been blighted.

But is not strong excitement the very thing we need in religion? Do not men need to have their souls moved to their very depths? Do they not require to have their consciences startled from slumber, their feelings aroused, and the powers of their minds summoned forth into active duty? Should not the preacher's address to them be piercing and thrilling? With all our heart we say, Yes! But is all this best effected by a fiery and unregulated zeal, — a zeal which has no enduring strength, no character for uniformity, but consists in convulsions of soul and convulsions of body? Or is it best effected by a zeal that is calm, orderly, self-subsistent, and abiding? Which of these kinds of zeal are we to prefer? The latter, by all means. We should prefer it because its calmness is the calmness of power, because it moves with a clear-sighted view of the object, and of the obstacle, too, which opposes its course, and is thus a zeal "according to knowledge." We should prefer it because of its constancy, because it is not a brawling brook of the surface, which will soon show a dry and parched channel, but the strong and unfailing, though silent, stream from an exhaustless fountain. The *furious* zealot expends all his feeling, he makes a show of his *whole heart*, he pours out all his emotion on his bodily

movements and gestures. This excites in the hearer only a violent and short-lived sympathy. But he whose zeal is as calm as it is deep operates in a widely different manner and to far better purpose. He gathers in and restrains the fulness of his heart lest it should overpower the external man. He subdues his emotion lest his emotion should subdue him. So deep is his affection for the souls of his hearers that he almost fears to speak and tell them how deep it is. He presses it back into his heart, though his heart be full to bursting. The affection which is expressed seems to overflow its bounds, refusing any longer to be restrained within them. This is the zeal of a love that is boundless and unfathomable. This is the zeal which, with all its calmness and self-restraint, produces not only strong but right excitement, — which moves the soul to its depths though the movement be not like the roaring of winds and the lashing of billows, but while it is unseen and unheard, is yet of mighty, yea, incalculable energy. This is the zeal which binds the soul of the hearer to the soul of the preacher, and to the duties and hopes of its existence, in bonds which not the wasting action of an hour, or a life, or a death, or an eternity shall sever.

It is this inexpressible and almost fearful interest in and affection for the souls of our fellow-creatures, which, with a power as calm as that which preserves the steady glory of the firmament, draws them to the embrace of Christian affection. They long to know how much of sympathy and love lies in the preacher's heart beyond that which he can express, which he dares express. Their sympathy has an anxious curiosity to know the fulness and power of his sympathy, — and how much of affection on their part is included in this curiosity! We appeal to everyone's experience in this question of zeal. We ask, Have not the most thrilling appeals been made when the strength expended in physical action and movement might have been supplied, we were going to say by the arm of an infant? Have not tones as gentle as a zephyr's murmur reached even to the inner chambers of the heart, and there taking up a kind of spiritual existence have they not preserved themselves in ceaseless echoes, and called, like voices from another world, to repentance and holiness of life? We speak not here from any mere excitement of the fancy. For ourselves we can, with the most sober and literal truth, answer these questions in the affirmative. Oh, when the Christian preacher's own spirit is ordered aright, when his heart is imbued and pervaded with the holy influences of his

faith, there is a love and zeal which need not to be arrayed in any exterior pomp of language and gesture. They need not to be attested by extravagant demonstrations of passion, by the groans of a morbid and unearthly agony, or by nerves and muscles wrought up to a physical frenzy.

We have exhibited very briefly two kinds of zeal, or two modes of presenting and impressing religious truth, in contrast with each other. We would by no means intimate that all preachers are marked entirely by one or the other of these kinds of zeal as we have described them. Still we know, as all must know, that there are both theoretical and practical errors as to what is the best and most efficient zeal, and it becomes everyone to consider how far he has receded from that zeal which is pure and elevated, while at the same time it is characterized by a ceaseless activity and a burning enthusiasm, and how near he has approached to the zeal of extravagance and fury and moral intoxication. But error and danger in this matter lie on both sides. On both sides we apprehend there is actual mistake committed, and actual harm done. It is wrong in itself and destructive to the souls of men to identify emotion with frenzy, power with tumult, piety with extravagance; but it is perhaps equally wrong and injurious to suppose that what is calm must be energetic, or that there may not be a clear and cold rationality without a warm and glowing piety. And for ourselves we confess we look with more pleasure or with less pain upon ill-judged and morbid excitement, if it arise from real feeling, if the extravagance be the honest extravagance of the heart, and the whole do not better merit the appellation of a mere tragic show, than we look upon this spiritual coldness and deadness. If the alternative be presented, we would rather the intellect might be consumed in the heart than the heart frozen in the intellect. But, thanks to Him who framed our nature, the alternative is not presented, nor will it be so long as man's reason can enlighten and purify his feelings, so long as his feelings can cherish and exalt his reason.

We began with mentioning the reproach which is cast on Unitarians on account of the coldness of their system and the coldness of their preaching. We think that a candid mind would so apply some of the suggestions which have been made as to remove, in a great measure, that reproach. Still we do not claim for Unitarians even a perfectly just and right zeal, — a quality which when possessed by a whole sect would, in our apprehension, go far towards proving that sect

to have reached the pure truth, and which, in individuals, is one of the rarest attainments of the Christian character. But how is that zeal to be acquired which shall act both on Christians and on ungodly men with the most thrilling and soul-stirring energy? We answer generally, and for the sake of distinction in terms somewhat technical, — by adding to the love of truth the love of souls. Our business is not simply to seek after all knowledge with persevering ardour, not simply to welcome it to our embrace when found, and to let it purify our own minds, but we are to apply it to the souls of "our brethren, our kinsmen according to the flesh," and in its application we are to labour and suffer, and, if need be, die. Our silent study by the midnight lamp is to be endured for those whose bodies and souls are wrapt in slumber, our vigils prolonged in anxiety for the salvation of a sleeping world. We are not to be selfish solitaries who have shrunk away in disgust from the touch of human feeling and from connexion with human sympathy, but we are to mingle our life and thought with the life and thought of the world about us. We are to be, in the expression already used, lovers not only of truth but of human souls. Some seem to imagine that by withdrawing from a near communion with the weak, ignorant, and sinful men about them — who, weak, ignorant, and sinful as they are, have annexed to their souls the fearful condition of immortality — they shall induce truth to visit them with higher communications. But let them recollect that she has no sympathy with unkind and selfish souls. However brilliant their fancy and tender their susceptibilities, — and, strange to think, such a fancy and such susceptibilities sometimes belong to those who have also the unkindness and selfishness of which we speak, — truth, with her large and generous spirit, finds their minds too narrow for her abode. She loves those most and blesses with her most ample revelations those who look with affection and with fellow-feeling on all, who embrace the whole of humanity in their regards; fellow-feeling, we say, for there is a sort of ideal, imaginative kindness which has little connexion with what we mean by generous fellow-feeling. Many, who would fain believe themselves universal philanthropists, and into the constitution of whose souls affection does in truth enter largely, are yet very far from having, or *desiring* to have, a real communion of soul with their species. They have a universal *kindness*, but they have not, and seem hardly desirous of having, a universal sympathy. Their affection

seems to be abstract, inactive, unapplied. Oh, let them remember, that for such an affection, they have no more merit than for being made in the shape of men rather than of brutes, — no more merit than for having within them noble dispositions and the image of God instead of being endowed with base propensities and a beastly nature. Would they please God, bless their race, and save their own souls? They must give to their affection a definite and an extensive application by the energy of a virtuous will. The world needs no theoretical philanthropy, — none of that imaginative sympathy which is too selfish to endure the presence of misery, and would have all objects of wretchedness removed from its sight lest the luxury of its own ideal bliss should be disturbed, which ever avoids being introduced to a soul that needs instruction and comfort lest it should have to abandon its own self-occupation and self-delight, — none of those good hearts whose goodness is consistent and almost identical with indifference to the interests of humanity, and which, while they could enjoy their solitary satisfaction, would be rent with little anguish were the whole world to sink away from them down to the place of despair. No! those are wanted who will have a warm, practical, earnest, and even *agonizing* sympathy with human souls, those who can weep, as did the Saviour over the devoted city, over those who will not know "the things which belong unto their peace," — those who shall "thank God that their own lot is bound up in that of the human race."

C. A. B.

Analogy of Debts and Sins.

The word *debts*, as used in the prayer which Christ taught his disciples, and in the parable of the king who would take account of his servants, justifies the belief that there is some analogy between debts and moral trespasses or sins. Were there no analogy between the two, we should see no propriety in the petition, "Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors," nor between the parable and its moral as given by our Lord himself. For in both cases debts are metaphorically used to represent sins.

There are different senses in which men may become in-

debted to each other, and different ways of becoming indebted. I become indebted to my neighbour when I purchase anything of him for which I promise to pay a certain sum of money. I may also become indebted to him by receiving favours for which he demands no compensation. This, however, is a debt of gratitude, and of a different nature from the other. In the latter sense, children are greatly indebted to kind parents; and we are all in the same sense indebted to God. Such debts are not in themselves sins. They, however, bring us under moral obligations to love and obey our Maker. By disregarding these obligations, or by neglecting or refusing to obey his precepts, we are guilty of sin, and become exposed to the penalty of his law.

Debts and sins are in some respects analogous; in others they are not. They are analogous, as each implies *obligations uncancelled*, and as each may be *forgiven*. In some other respects they are not analogous. A debt may be paid and thus cancelled, either by the debtor or his surety or friend; but sin cannot be paid or cancelled, either by the sinner or by any third person. If not forgiven, its penalty must be inflicted on the sinner himself. The principles of justice, which are the principles of the divine government, do not permit that one should be punished as a substitute for another, nor that any man should be punished for any sin but his own. The son shall not be punished for the sin of his father; nor the father for the sin of his son; nor the innocent as a substitute for the guilty. The Lord has said, "The soul that sinneth it shall die"; and he has explained the words as meaning that one shall not die for the sin of another, but every man shall die for his own sins, *except he repent*. Particular care, however, was taken to have it understood that God has no pleasure in the death of the wicked, and to assure us that his desire is that the wicked should repent, and that if they do repent they shall not perish. "When the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness that he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive." In this chapter, and in the thirty-third chapter of the same book, we have the last quoted sentiment several times repeated, with some diversity of form, that there may be no mistake in a matter so important. In one case it is said of the wicked man that repents, "All his transgressions that he hath committed, they shall not be mentioned unto him; *in his righteousness that he hath done he shall live*." In another verse it is said, "But if the wicked

turn from his wickedness, and do that which is lawful and right, *he shall live thereby.*" — *Ezek.* xviii. 4, 27, 22; xxxiii. 19.

Multitudes of Christians, however, have supposed that the sufferings of Christ were a vicarious punishment inflicted by God for our sins, and that his sufferings are the only ground on which the sins of the penitent are forgiven. This hypothesis seems to me a plain contradiction to the revealed principles of divine government, as stated in Ezekiel. But this is not all. It supposes that punishment inflicted is the only ground of pardon under the divine government. Those who maintain this doctrine suppose that the sufferings of Christ were a substituted punishment, answering all the purposes which would have been answered by the endless punishment of all mankind. But let it be considered that *deserved punishment* is what is *remitted* in the *pardon of offences.* How, then, can punishment, after it is inflicted, be the ground of forgiveness? Would it not be folly for a man to say he forgave a debt, after it had been paid to the last mill? Is it not equally incorrect to suppose that God forgives our sins after Christ has borne the punishment due to them, and even makes that substituted punishment the ground of forgiveness?

Is it possible that intelligent men have duly reflected on this subject, and still believe that the wisdom and benevolence of God is displayed in making punishment inflicted the only ground of pardon? Must not a reflecting man be bewildered by strong prejudices if he can really believe that the same penalty is both *inflicted* and *forgiven?* Suppose forty stripes save one to be a just penalty for a certain crime; can that penalty be inflicted, and that infliction thus made the ground of forgiveness? What remains to be forgiven after the penalty is inflicted?

NOAH WORCESTER.

Study of the Scriptures.

What is requisite in order to render scriptural inquiry judicious and profitable? I answer, a clear understanding of the respective offices and mutual relations of reason and revelation, and also freedom from prejudice.

1. A clear understanding of the respective offices and mutual relations of reason and revelation.

Reason is that faculty of the mind which draws or approves conclusions from given premises. Revelation implies the discovery of what was before unknown, or the confirmation of what was previously open to doubt. Its office is to inform us of truths which were beyond the province of reason, or to assure us of truths which to the eye of reason were probable but not certain. At the present day two opposite faults prevail in the study of the Christian Scriptures. There are those who, while they admit the authority of reason in every other department, exclude it from religion; and there are those, on the other hand, who, forgetting that the mind knows not all things, and that reason can draw conclusions from known premises only, hold that we are bound to receive on the authority of revelation no truth the reasonableness of which is not perfectly obvious.

The first class of inquirers draw from Scripture, and feel themselves bound to believe doctrines which, as they themselves confess, are contrary to reason. But when is a doctrine contrary to reason? When from incontrovertible premises we draw a conclusion which cannot be true if that doctrine be true. Now I maintain that a revelation from God cannot teach such a doctrine. For whence did we derive the faculty which we now call reason? From God. And for what end did he bestow it? To guide us in belief and action. And what must be his purpose in giving us a revelation? To guide us in belief and action. Do reason and revelation contradict each other? If so, God has given us two inconsistent guides for belief and action. But this is impossible, if we believe the divine character is one of consistent veracity. If, therefore, we *admit* the divine veracity, we must reject one of these guides; or if we *doubt* it, we can depend upon neither. Thus the fact that its doctrines contradicted reason would be a sufficient ground for denying the divine authority of what purported to be a revelation from God.

But you may say that we cannot pass sentence upon a doctrine of divine revelation, because human reason is fallible and often leads to erroneous results. That it often leads to erroneous results everyone must admit. But I maintain that it is infallible, that every conclusion drawn by it follows necessarily from the premises from which it is derived, and that we are led to wrong conclusions simply because we

adopt wrong premises. It has been well observed that the fool reasons wrong even on right premises, and the madman right on wrong premises. Indeed the infallibility of his reason is the only thing which distinguishes the sane man from the idiot, and in many respects we are all madmen. On the most momentous subjects, with reference to the relations which we bear to God and eternity, we madly receive as truths propositions for which we have not the slightest evidence. Upon such premises we indeed reason correctly; but our conclusions may be false, may be absurd, since they are based upon premises which have not been submitted to the test of reason, upon false premises. Our systems of faith are thus like the house in the parable, skilfully framed, skilfully erected, but founded upon the sand, and therefore at the mercy of the first breath of wind or dash of the torrent's spray.

If, then, it is impossible that a revelation from God should teach doctrines contrary to reason, it is of prime importance in our study of the Christian Scriptures to ascertain whether they actually teach such doctrines. As firmly as I believe that they were written by holy men moved by the holy spirit, so firmly do I believe that they contain no such doctrines. But such have been drawn from single, disconnected passages. Such passages it is the duty of the inquirer after truth to compare with their context, and with the circumstances, modes of expression, and general purpose of the author; and he, who can thus enlighten himself or others as to the true meaning of a text which ignorance and party zeal have long quoted in support of an absurdity, does an essential service to our religion by depriving its adversaries of a valid argument against its divinity. Let us, then, in our scriptural researches ever remember that while God disciplines us in the midst of those things which are seen and temporal, he has made it the privilege, the noblest prerogative of reason, to interpret his oracles concerning things unseen and eternal.

But while we admit no doctrine contrary to reason, let us carefully guard against the opposite error, an unwillingness to receive, on the authority of Scripture, doctrines which might not have been rendered probable by reason independently of revelation. Reason is the power of drawing conclusions from given premises. But where no premises are given, no conclusion can be drawn. Revelation may communicate truth on subjects on which we previously had no premises whereon to ground a process of reasoning, on which we were previously

ignorant. And in that case it is our duty to follow implicitly the instructions of revelation, which we should not have needed at all had reason been able to take cognizance of all the sources of truth. On such subjects as the future destinies of the world, the state of the soul after death, the certainty, nature, and duration of future punishment, reason has no premises from which to draw its conclusions. Yet these are subjects, if there are any such, worthy of a divine revelation; and if we find competent proof that the Christian Scriptures contain such a revelation, it becomes us on those momentous topics to which it principally relates to adopt its instructions, without attempting to modify them by the suggestions of reason. The truths which they reveal to us are indeed *above* reason; but unless they contradict reason, it is presumptuous to gainsay them. When we assert the sufficiency of reason to guide us into all truth we deny the necessity of a revelation, which God forbid we should do.

From what has been said as to the mutual relations of reason and revelation, we derive the following practical rules: First, reason being infallible so far as its province extends, we should on no consideration adopt tenets contrary to reason; and second, on subjects above the cognizance of reason we should be ready to receive whatever doctrine Scripture fairly interpreted teaches, whether reason independently of revelation teaches it or not.

2. But would we profitably conduct our scriptural researches, something more is necessary than the mere recognition of these principles. We must disrobe ourselves of prejudice.

Personal, local, sectarian prejudice has done infinitely more to retard the progress of truth than misapprehensions on the subject already discussed. In fact it has occasioned such misapprehensions. The instructions of consciousness and experience as to the nature and province of reason, the dictates of reason as to the design of revelation, have all been set aside by prejudice. We are either educated in some system of doctrines which before we are able to judge for ourselves we are taught to regard as of divine authority; or else we derive our first religious impressions from some teacher ardently attached to a particular system, which we, by the instinct of gratitude or by some nameless impulse, are led to adopt and cherish as our own. When we begin to consult the volume of inspiration, we read, not to see what truth is actually revealed there, but to seek confirmation in the belief of doctrines which we are previously assured must

be found there. We consider as essential to the Christian system or scheme the doctrines which we have imbibed, wrest in their support every text of doubtful import, and too often apply the threats and denunciations against unbelievers to those who cannot interpret Scripture as we do. We sit down to the perusal of the gospel with a determination to find such and such doctrines upon its pages,— not with a humble resolution to receive whatever truth may there present itself. And in this case, whether the doctrines which we hold are true or false, they are mere prejudices, since we found them neither on impartial examination nor rational conviction.

Now this is the way in which the partisans of different sects confirm themselves in the belief of the tenets of those sects. Of course so many contradictory doctrines are not found in the Scriptures; but the imagination of every man arrays the oracles of divine truth in the dress which his prejudices would have them wear. Thus the Trinitarian sees a God, the Humanitarian a man, in every act of the suffering, dying, risen Saviour. The Universalist applies himself to the study of the Scriptures with a full belief that it is inconsistent with God's mercy to punish sin in another world, and the magic of this belief softens in his eye the harshest expressions of the divine displeasure, and strips the day of judgment of its terrors; while his no less prejudiced opponent sees vials of fiery indignation poured forth over those pages that beam with pure, unmingled love. The Episcopalian marks out nice distinctions of office in the apostolic church, and arrays its overseers in robes of episcopal authority; while the Presbyterian, in his zeal for equal rights among the clergy, snatches the mitre from the head upon which an apostle's hand had placed it. Would we derive truth from the Scriptures we must adopt the opposite course. We must apply ourselves to their study with childlike simplicity, with a sense of our ignorance, and of the inadequacy of human knowledge, and a willingness fearlessly to embrace its dictates, however much opposed to the prejudices which friendship, parental love, virtue, or piety may have hallowed.

A. P. Peabody.

The Coming of the Son of Man.

Mr. Editor,

In your number for March was a query on the text in Matt. xvi. 27, 28., "For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom." This passage has been a source of much doubt and perplexity to many sincere inquirers in every age, from the time of our Saviour down to the present. To the primitive disciples it seemed strongly to indicate the personal reäppearance of Jesus at no very distant day, and we accordingly find them in the midst of their persecutions and trials anxiously looking forward to this event as the consummation of their wishes, the fulfilment of their hopes. They united with this expectation that of the resurrection of the just and the commencement of the millennium, and they fondly anticipated that with their Master at their head they should reign together a thousand years in the new Jerusalem. The same expectation, notwithstanding the distinct declaration in the last part of the passage that the Son of Man would come before that generation had passed away, — notwithstanding this, the same expectation has been revived in successive ages; and in times not very remote from our own we have heard that the period of this mighty consummation was at hand, that the age of the millennium was approaching, that the Son of Man was about to make his appearance with power and great glory.

Now without inquiring into the origin of these ideas, I wish simply to remark that they have no foundation, as a matter of course, in the language before us, — that this is a prophecy the fulfilment of which is limited by its very terms to the age of the apostles, to the lifetime of some who heard the words from our Saviour's own lips. "Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom." The question naturally arises, What were the circumstances, what were the events in the apostolic age, which may be regarded as the accomplishment of this prophecy? for it is an obvious remark that the only safe and sound interpretation of language like this is to be found in the history which it was intended to

predict. To what, then, we inquire, did our Saviour probably have reference, and in what manner was the prophecy fulfilled?

The fact that our Saviour did not appear in person to take possession of the throne of Judea is sufficient, one would think, to establish the point that the language before us is not to be taken in its literal acceptation. It is proved by the event that it was not an outward and visible appearance to which he referred, that it was not an outward and visible throne that he intended to establish. It is well known, moreover, that, conformably to the previous conceptions of the Jews, the Christian dispensation is frequently represented in the New Testament under the figure of a kingdom. Adapting himself, as he did, to the poor and feeble conceptions of his countrymen, our Saviour frequently spoke of the influence of his religion in the human soul as the coming of the kingdom of God, as the establishing of the reign of the Messiah. On one occasion, we know, when he was inquired of by the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God should come, he answered them and said, "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation; neither shall ye say, Lo, here! or, Lo there! for behold the kingdom of God is within you." It is for these reasons we conclude that the language of the text is to be looked upon as figurative, that the subject of general reference is the establishment of Christianity in the world as a new and separate religion. In this view it is the language of strong encouragement to the little company of disciples, and of solemn warning to the rulers and people who were about to reject the Anointed of God. He tells them that although they were small and few in number, although they were at present despised and persecuted, although appearances were all against them, yet his cause and the cause of truth would assuredly triumph; that although they should forsake him in the hour of his trial and one should deny him and another should betray him, though he himself should be taken from them by cruel hands, yet he would come again in the spirit and power of his religion and restore them to himself. He would come again in the glory of his Father, through his appointed messengers; he would come with those principles which should convince the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment, and would requite to every man according to his deeds; he would come in his kingdom and take possession of his throne in the hearts and consciences of his sincere disciples. But when will he come? was the anxious inquiry;

When shall this be? Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here who shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming to reign, till they see these principles well established in the world.

From this view of the prophecy let us turn to the fulfilment. Before thirty years had elapsed from the time these words were uttered, while many of the first disciples and preachers of Christianity were living, we learn, upon the authority of profane as well as sacred historians, that Christianity had spread itself through Judea, Samaria, and Galilee, through almost all the numerous districts of Lesser Asia, through Greece and the islands of the Ægean Sea, along the sea-coast of Africa, and even to Rome and into the heart of Italy. In the single city of Jerusalem the number of Christians is estimated, at the least calculation, to be twenty thousand; at Corinth and at Athens the religion was embraced by some of the most distinguished individuals; and in Rome it had extended into the palace of the emperor. In ten years more we find Christianity in the most remote corners of the civilized world. It went forth with the strong confirmation of miraculous power, conquering and to conquer. In the short space of forty years from the time of the ascension, the church, which had assembled in an upper chamber in one of the streets of Jerusalem, had extended itself through all the avenues of the immense Roman empire. The vine which had sprung up in weakness, and which seemed liable at first to be cut off by the slightest attack, continued to gain deeper and deeper root, till it had shot forth its boughs to the sea and its branches to the river, till all the nations of the then known world had partaken of its fruit and reposed under its shade. This may be considered as the first great epoch in the establishment of Christianity, and this is comprehended in the lifetime of the apostles.

There is one event, especially, in the early history of the planting of Christianity, which, from its important bearing upon the success of the gospel, is more prominent than any other. It is frequently alluded to in this connexion by our Saviour himself and by many of the apostles. I refer to the destruction of the city and temple of Jerusalem. To the mind of a Jew no event could be more dreadful than that which was so distinctly foretold by our Saviour. To him it was indeed the end of the world, it involved the extinction of his national hopes, of his worldly prospects. When the temple fell, then fell the power and pomp of Judaism; when

the incense on the altar ceased to burn, when the holy of holies was trod by the unclean feet of the Roman soldiery, then was the ceremonial law extinguished. To the mind of a Christian in those days no event could be more interesting, as none was more important to the full establishment of his religion. We shall see the importance of this event more distinctly when we remember that so long as the city and temple stood firm the controversy still existed whether the Jews, who had long been the peculiar people of God, still continued to hold that relation. The destruction and dispersion of the nation had been foretold as their punishment. Until this was really inflicted, until the Jew was distinctly and visibly cut off from his former relation, the evidence of the truth of Christianity was not fully completed. Had that generation passed entirely away and the Jewish temples and altars remained standing, it would of course have been decided that Jesus had proved a false prophet, and the decision would have triumphed. In addition to this it may be remarked that in the apostolic times the Jews were almost the sole persecutors of the Christians. Wherever the apostles went the Jews were always the foremost in exciting against them the anger of the populace. From this it is evident that the downfall of Judaism was rendered absolutely necessary to the full and entire establishment of Christianity. Until that took place the question in controversy was not settled, the evidence was not completed, the prophecy was not fulfilled, the rod of Jewish persecution was not broken.

Now the destruction of the Jews is foretold in language closely resembling the passage before us. We cannot doubt that the same general subject is referred to, that the same events were in the mind of our Saviour in both cases. In fact the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth chapters of Matthew are in answer to the question, "What shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world?" The answer is, When the forms of Judaism shall be destroyed, when the desolating abomination that is spoken of by Daniel, — the Roman army with its ensigns and eagles, — shall stand upon the holy soil, when this beautiful temple with its fair proportions shall be levelled with the ground, when the sun shall be darkened and the moon shall not give her light, when, in fact, the principles of true religion shall be deeply rooted in the hearts of my disciples, then will the sign of the Son of Man appear, then will commence the reign of the Messiah, then will the kingdom of heaven be begun. It is for these reasons, among

others, that the destruction of the Jewish city and temple is so intimately blended as we find it in our Bibles with the coming of the Son of Man. It was his coming in the spirit and power of his religion, — it was his coming in his kingdom and in the glory of his Father, — it was coming in his capacity of Judge of the world, to requite to every man according to his deeds, to execute judgment upon a nation that had abused their privileges and rejected the offers of love and mercy. In the history that has come down to us of the Jewish war, the long and painful siege which the city underwent, the distress of its inhabitants, and its final and complete overthrow, — in these the prophecy before us, so far as it respected this particular event, was exactly and literally fulfilled.

I have thus shown that the obvious and primary reference of the passage, the reference which our Saviour intended, was to that establishment of his religion in the hearts of men which took place in the lifetime of the apostles. The remainder of the inquiry I will notice in your next number.

Yours,

H. B. Goodwin.

Manufactures in their Influence upon Pauperism.

No. I.

SMALL MANUFACTURING ESTABLISHMENTS.

A few general remarks should be premised. There is a great difference between manufactures which provide the necessaries and those which provide the luxuries of life. The demand for luxuries depends upon the whim and caprice of fashion. Those employed in such manufactures are therefore exposed to extreme and ruinous fluctuations. To be sure, more than the actual cost is usually paid for the fripperies of fashion; but as a matter of fact, — and it is a fact which reason might lead us to suspect, — no class of labourers are so meanly paid as those who are engaged in administering to the factitious wants of the fashionable world, and no class is exposed to such distress from want of employment. Instead, therefore, of looking with a childish envy upon nations which furnish us with finery, we should with all due humility congratulate ourselves that we have something better to do;

that among us men of all orders rest their hopes of support upon something more substantial than the filmy gossamer, which is blown about by the breeze of fashion. We should discourage this species of manufacture, and be content to receive supplies from abroad, however severely those who set their hearts upon such things may suffer by being deprived of a particular kind of ribbon or lace, in consequence of the uncertainty of a foreign market.

Another general remark that we would make is, that though it should be proved that the manufacture of necessary things does in some slight degree contribute to pauperism, — that is, though it should appear that those employed in this sort of manufacture are more subject to the evils of pauperism than other classes of labourers, — it by no means follows that manufactures are injurious to the community, or even to the poor themselves. For we cannot be independent without them. If all manufactured articles came from abroad, a war or any other casualty which should cut off the supply would expose us to great distress ; and as the poor and those bordering upon the regions of poverty are always the first to suffer in any pressure of this kind, there can be no doubt that they would thus be exposed to a severity of suffering which they are not called to undergo by any little and gradual increase of poverty that manufactures may cause. Though the operatives themselves should suffer more than other classes now do, it must not be forgotten that their labours contribute in no small measure to the ease and comfort of all other classes of society ; and that without their labours their own condition, in common with that of all others, might be even lower than it now is.

With these introductory remarks we would state it as our opinion that small manufacturing establishments scattered through the country, though liable to some considerable evils, are yet a great preventive of poverty.

A well cultivated country is able to support at least twice as many inhabitants as can be profitably employed in tillage. If a large proportion of those not employed in agriculture are engaged in manufactures, they are contributing to the comfort of those who work upon the soil, and in return receive their food and the raw materials for manufacture. The two classes mutually benefit each other. But if, on the other hand, only a few are manufacturers, there will, at least in inland places, be a surplus of agricultural labour ; its price will of course be below its proper level, and few besides freeholders will be in

a comfortable situation. A great proportion of the mere labourers will have no means of earning an adequate support, and the poverty must be oppressive.

We would not, however, rest the doctrine upon reasoning so general. Anyone acquainted with country towns wholly agricultural must know that many of the inhabitants, during parts of the year, can find no profitable employment; and also that there will be many whose labour can at no time be turned to account. Widows, or women with shiftless or intemperate husbands, may have large families of girls and young children, whose united exertions in a merely farming district cannot procure a comfortable living; and they may be obliged, however great their reluctance, and however willing to work they may be, to be occasionally assisted either by the hand of private charity or by the public bounty. But if there chance to spring up a small manufacturing establishment in their neighbourhood, a place is at once afforded where they find employment. We need no further proof of this than the advance in the price of female labour among us within the last fifteen years. Many are the families in which the helpless young and the equally helpless old are comfortably supported by the labours of those between the ages of childhood and maturity. And all this is done without many of the evils which are attendant upon overgrown manufacturing towns. The simplicity of rural life is not destroyed; the healthiness of a country situation is preserved; comfortable habitations may be provided; and the strong ties of kindred, which make home a place of instruction and delight, the abode of peace, the nursery of pure affections and holy feelings, are kept unbroken.

But the advantage stops not here. Farmers are provided with a ready market for their produce, and the expense of distant transportation is avoided. Each town is thus rendered in a great degree independent. Besides, no considerable manufacture can be carried on without scientific knowledge. The superintendents must be scientific men. But men of science stationed in our villages must do something to diffuse knowledge, to raise the intellectual character of the people, and thus indirectly prevent pauperism. This, however, from a variety of counteracting causes, is but a small thing.

J. H. Morison.

Letters to Unbelievers.

No. IV.

RELIGIOUS OPINIONS OF THOMAS JEFFERSON.

Fellow-Citizens,

I concluded my last letter with the assertion that I never knew a man, that I never heard of a man, that I never read of a man, who had examined the evidences of natural and revealed religion with honesty and candour and patience, who remained an unbeliever. I am therefore naturally led to notice the belief of those distinguished men of our country whom you claim as infidels; and I am bound to show, either that they were Christians, or that they were ignorant of the foundation on which Christianity securely rests. The following quotation from the Lectures of Frances Wright will disclose the names of some eminent individuals whom you are exceedingly anxious to enrol on the list of infidelity: —

"Would not the American people do better to seek the opinions of their great men in their own works and those of their confidential cotemporaries, than in the trash of the tract-house and the libels of the pulpit? Would they not do well to understand, before they take the alarm at the senseless cry of *infidel*, that Washington, that Jefferson, that Franklin, that John Adams, that Ethan Allen, that Horatio Gates, and ALL the nobler host of worthies who secured this country's independence, were *all*, according to the priestly acceptation of a meaningless word, *infidels;* that is, *all* disbelieved the compound Jewish and Christian system, and looked upon its mysteries and its miracles as upon nursery tales?" — *Lectures*, p. 13.

In the present communication I wish to invite your attention to the religious opinions of Thomas Jefferson. I shall prove, from his own writings and from a letter from his granddaughter, *that he called himself a Christian, and wished to be so considered by his fellow-men; that he disclaimed the name of unbeliever, and desired that his reputation might never be blackened by the epithet of infidel.*

1. Did Mr. Jefferson disclaim infidelity and call himself a

Christian? Read the following extract from a letter to the celebrated Dr. Rush:—

"In some of the delightful conversations with you, in the evenings of 1798–99, and which served as an anodyne to the afflictions of the crisis through which our country was then labouring, the Christian religion was sometimes our topic; and I then promised you that, one day or other, I would give you my views of it. They are the result of a life of inquiry and reflection, and very different from that anti-Christian system imputed to me by those who know nothing of my opinions. To the corruptions of Christianity I am indeed opposed; but not to the genuine precepts of Jesus himself. *I am a Christian, in the only sense in which he wished anyone to be;* sincerely attached to his doctrines, in preference to all others; ascribing to himself every human excellence, and believing he never claimed any other." — *Works*, Vol. III. p. 506.

What do you make of this testimony? Does he not affirm that his views of the gospel are very different from that anti-Christian or infidel system sometimes imputed to him by those ignorant of his religious opinions? Does he not unequivocally declare himself a Christian believer? Does he not ascribe to Jesus human perfection, *every* human excellence? How can you dispose of such explicit statements? Will unbelievers now assent to these declarations? No. Let them no longer, then, claim a person whose very words pronounce their condemnation.

2. What views did Mr. Jefferson entertain concerning Jesus and his religion? Read the following extracts from his published letters:—

"In this state of things among the Jews, Jesus appeared. His parentage was obscure; his condition poor; his education null; his natural endowments great; his life correct and innocent; he was meek, benevolent, patient, firm, disinterested, and of the sublimest eloquence."

"He corrected the deism of the Jews, confirming them in their belief of one only God, and giving them juster notions of his attributes and government. His moral doctrines, relating to kindred and friends, were more pure and perfect than those of the most correct of the philosophers, and greatly more so than those of the Jews; and they went far beyond both in inculcating universal philanthropy, not only to kindred and friends, to neighbours and countrymen, but to all mankind, gathering all into one family, under the bonds of love, charity, peace, common wants, and common aids."

"The precepts of philosophy and of the Hebrew code laid hold of actions only. He pushed his scrutinies into the heart of man, erected his tribunal in the region of his thoughts, and purified the waters at the fountain-head. He taught emphatically the doctrine of a future state, which was either doubted or disbelieved by the Jews; and wielded it with efficacy as an important incentive, supplementary to the other motives to moral conduct." — *Works*, Vol. III. pp. 508–9.

"This free exercise of reason is all I ask for the vindication of the character of Jesus. We find in the writings of his biographers, ... sublime ideas of the Supreme Being, aphorisms and precepts of the purest morality and benevolence sanctioned by a life of humility, innocence, and simplicity of manners, neglect of riches, absence of worldly ambition and honours, with an eloquence and persuasiveness which have not been surpassed. These could not be the inventions of the grovelling authors who relate them. They are far beyond the powers of their feeble minds. They show that there was a character, the subject of their history, whose splendid conceptions were above all suspicion of being interpolations from their hands." — *Works*, Vol. IV. p. 326.

"It is the innocence of his character, the purity and sublimity of his moral precepts, the eloquence of his inculcations, the beauty of the apologues in which he conveys them, that I so much admire; sometimes, indeed, needing indulgence to eastern hyperbolism." — *Works*, Vol. IV. p. 321.

Do your writers speak in this manner concerning Christ and his gospel? I have lately read not a little of the writings of modern unbelievers, and I have found nothing respecting Jesus and his religion but condemnation. Why, then, will you persist in claiming a man whose very words contradict your constant assertions? But a few more passages shall finish this division.

"The doctrines of Jesus are simple, and tend all to the happiness of man. 1. That there is one only God, and he all-perfect. 2. That there is a future state of rewards and punishments. 3. That to love God with all thy heart and thy neighbour as thyself is the sum of religion. These are the great points on which he endeavoured to reform the religion of the Jews..... Had the doctrines of Jesus been preached always as pure as they came from his lips, the whole civilized world would now have been Christian. — *Works*, Vol. IV. p. 349.

"The Christian religion, when divested of the rags in which they have enveloped it, and brought to the original purity and simplicity of its benevolent institutor, is a religion of all others

most friendly to liberty, science, and the freest expansion of the human mind." — *Works*, Vol. III. p. 463.

"If the moral precepts innate in man, and made a part of his physical constitution as necessary for a social being, if the sublime doctrines of philanthropism and deism taught us by Jesus of Nazareth, in which all agree, constitute true religion, then without it, this would be, as you again say, 'something not fit to be named, even indeed a hell.'" — *Works*, Vol. IV. p. 301.

I could quote many more passages of a similar description; but these must be sufficient to satisfy the most skeptical that the writer never belonged to your party. You must perceive the injustice of claiming one as an unbeliever who could conscientiously utter such sentiments respecting Jesus and his religion. You must admit that your female leader has discovered no small share of ignorance or dishonesty in her bold and unsupported assertions.

3. Did Mr. Jefferson rejoice in the spread of Christianity? Did he desire to have any one denomination prevail? Or did he wish, like your writers, to banish the gospel from the face of the earth? Read the following extracts, and then decide these inquiries for yourselves: —

"I rejoice that in this blessed country of free inquiry and belief, which has surrendered its creed and conscience to neither kings nor priests, the genuine doctrine of one only God is reviving; and I trust that there is not a young man now living in the United States who will not die an Unitarian." — *Works*, Vol. IV. pp. 349–50.

"Happy in the prospect of a restoration of primitive Christianity, I must leave to younger athletes to encounter and lop off the false branches which have been engrafted into it by the mythologists of the middle and modern ages. I am not aware of the peculiar resistance to Unitarianism which you ascribe to Pennsylvania. . . . . This doctrine has not yet been preached to us; but the breeze begins to be felt which precedes the storm; and fanaticism is all in a bustle, shutting its doors and windows to keep it out. But it will come, and drive before it the foggy mists of Platonism which have so long obscured our atmosphere. I am in hopes some of the disciples of your institution [Harvard University] will become missionaries to us of these doctrines truly evangelical, and open our eyes to what has been so long hidden from them. A bold and eloquent preacher would be nowhere listened to with more freedom than in this state, nor with more firmness of mind. . . . . He might be excluded by our hierophants from their churches and meeting-houses, but would be attended in the fields by whole acres of hearers and think-

ers. Missionaries from Cambridge would soon be greeted with more welcome than from the tritheistical school of Andover. Such are my wishes, such would be my welcomes, warm and cordial as the assurances of my esteem and respect for you." — *Works*, Vol. IV. p. 354.

"I have to thank you for your pamphlets on the subject of Unitarianism, and to express my gratification with your efforts for the revival of primitive Christianity in your quarter..... And a strong proof of the solidity of the primitive faith is its restoration, as soon as a nation arises which vindicates to itself the freedom of religious opinion and its external divorce from the civil authority. The pure and simple unity of the Creator of the universe is now all but ascendant in the Eastern States; it is dawning in the West, and advancing towards the South; and I confidently expect that the present generation will see Unitarianism become the general religion of the United States. The Eastern presses are giving us many excellent pieces on the subject, and Priestley's learned writings on it are or should be in every hand." — *Works*, Vol. IV. p. 360.

Many more passages of a similar import might be quoted did my object require them or my limits permit their introduction. Is this the language of an unbeliever? Are these the words of an infidel? Are these the wishes and desires of an anti-Christian? Let your own publications answer. Let the infinite difference of your views and those expressed above cause your silence in future respecting this distinguished patriot.

4. Did Mr. Jefferson feel hurt at the imputation of infidelity? Did he speak of infidels as a class with which he had no connexion? Did he accuse them of rejecting the gospel without proper inquiry? For an answer to these questions, you may read the following extracts: —

"I promised you that, one day or other, I would give you my views of the Christian religion. They are very different from that *anti-Christian* system imputed to me by those who know nothing of my opinions." — *Works*, Vol. III. p. 506.

"They [the Orthodox clergy] wish it to be believed that he can have no religion who advocates its freedom." — *Works*, Vol. IV. p. 194.

"They [the doctrines of Jesus] have been still more disfigured by the corruptions of schismatizing followers, who have found an interest in sophisticating and perverting the simple doctrines he taught, by engrafting on them the mysticisms of a Grecian sophist, frittering them into subtilties, and obscuring them with jargon, *until they have caused good men to reject the whole in dis-*

gust, and to view Jesus himself as an impostor." — *Works*, Vol. III. pp. 508 – 9.

"Their blasphemies have *driven thinking men into infidelity*, who have *too hastily rejected* the supposed author himself, with the horrors so falsely imputed to him." — *Works*, Vol. IV. p. 349.

"If histories so unlike as those of Hercules and Jesus can by a fertile imagination and allegorical interpretations be brought to the same tally, no line of distinction remains between fact and fancy." — *Works*, Vol. IV. pp. 296 – 7.

And what is the meaning of all these remarks? Was the writer an anti-Christian, when he disclaimed the imputation of infidelity? Was he one of the good men who had rejected the gospel in disgust on account of the absurdities of some believers? Was he one of the number who had been driven into infidelity, and too hastily rejected the Christian religion, on account of the cruel doctrines of Calvinism? I suppose by this time you must be fully convinced that my position is proved. Under each of the divisions I could have greatly enlarged. I am sorry to be obliged to omit more than three quarters of the extracts I have made from his works with a special reference to this controversy; but the length of my article warns me to conclude with the still more convincing testimony which yet remains.

5. Finally, then, I present you, in proof of my position, a letter which I have received from a granddaughter of Mr. Jefferson. If any person can know the truth on this question, it is this lady. For she was the constant companion of her grandfather for a considerable period, and from childhood enjoyed, to a remarkable degree, his affection and confidence.

———, *January* 27, 1834.

Sir,

Your letter of the 23d of January was this morning received, and I hasten to reply to it, willing to give all the information I can on a subject of so much personal interest to myself, but compelled, for many reasons, to request that, whatever use you make of the few details I have it in my power to furnish, my own name may be kept out of sight. I apprehend, however, I can add but little to the information you already possess on the subject of Mr. Jefferson's religious opinions, which, judging from the spirit of your letter, is both copious and correct. Your plan of making him speak for himself is unquestionably the best that can be pursued; nor do I conceive it possible for anyone,

after an impartial perusal of his published works, to persist in applying to him the name of infidel; a name which for himself he ever disclaimed. Still, his letters on religious subjects are scattered through the body of his correspondence, and much additional light may be thrown on the nature of his opinions by their being brought together, arranged, and condensed, in the able manner in which I have no doubt they will be in the work you are about to publish.

I regret that I can say but little of his last moments, as I was, unhappily for myself, absent from his dying bed. But I have it on the testimony of others, that he died as he had lived, a Christian philosopher. He was perfectly aware of the approach of death, and his last days were marked by a serenity most perfect. His thoughts were undisturbed by self-reproach, fear, or regret. His life had been long and most purely virtuous. In the latter part of it, however, his bodily sufferings had been great, and although he had borne them with exemplary patience he could not but feel that death came as a friend to release him from the burden of years and infirmities. He felt, too, that his work was done; and even amid those wanderings of the mind which precede dissolution and indicate that the soul is already poising her wings for flight, the words, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace," were among the last that he uttered. He had previously given his parting admonitions to the younger members of the family; whilst on each individual of the sorrowing friends who surrounded him he had bestowed some expression of comfort or tenderness. He died a Christian; for although his views of the mission of Jesus were to a certain degree peculiar and different from those of others, yet he thought them the true ones, and claimed for himself the name of a follower of Christ. He always said he was a Christian, in what he understood to be the true sense of the word, and according to the doctrines which he believed were truly those of Jesus.

Mr. Jefferson's character, in spite of the mistakes which prevail among many persons in regard to it, was essentially Christian, and could have been formed under no other influences than those of the gospel. He was, if ever man was, merciful, pure in heart, a peace-maker, one who forgave his enemies not seven times but seventy times seven, doing his alms in secret, and praying, not at the corners of the streets, but in the retirement of his closet; and his heavenly Father, who heard him in secret, will perhaps one day reward him openly, when he shall receive from men the justice due to his true character and principles.

Mr. Jefferson's religious opinions have been variously represented, and almost always misrepresented. What I now assert I do on the authority of his own words and actions, heard and witnessed by myself. He entertained the greatest possible ad-

miration and veneration for the character and doctrines of Jesus, and few persons devote more time than he did to the reading and study of the New Testament. He had carefully prepared for his own use an abstract of the life and sayings of Jesus, extracting from the writings of the Evangelists such chapters or parts of chapters as appeared to him of the greatest power and beauty, and arranging them so as to form a continuous narrative; but a copy of the New Testament as it stands was always within reach of the chair which he usually occupied when he wrote or read. He frequently had recourse to it in his moments of retirement, and never more than when under the pressure of sorrow he sought the rest which is offered to the heavy laden. Upon one occasion, having experienced an affliction of the severest kind, he was found by the person who first ventured to interrupt the retirement of his grief, with the sacred volume in his hands; and in this he continued to read, at intervals, the whole time during which the agony of his feelings absorbed all thoughts but those which even then he could give to the words of the Saviour.

Nor was his love for the Scriptures entirely confined to the writings of the Evangelists. Although he never appeared to take the same pleasure in reading the Old Testament, yet there were parts which he greatly admired; many of the Psalms of David especially. Several of them I have heard him repeat from beginning to end, such as the twenty-third, "The Lord is my shepherd"; and the fifteenth, the metrical version of which,

> "Lord, who 's the happy man that may
> To thy blest courts repair?"

I have seen copied out in his own hand more than once. He was also in the habit of writing down such occasional hymns as pleased and satisfied him, and I have one or two written on small scraps of paper which I carefully preserve.

It may be worth while to mention, in passing, that his voice and manner were particularly impressive when he read aloud, as he sometimes did, passages from the New Testament, or repeated the Psalms of David. There was a feeling and an earnestness in his tones which added much to the effect of what he read. Of sacred music he was particularly fond, and especially of the old psalm-tunes, which he regretted much to find giving way in favour of more modern compositions. His voice continued sweet and unbroken to the last years of his life, and I have frequently heard him singing passages of the old psalms.

He was as regular an attendant at church as circumstances permitted, and frequently overcame obstacles of roads and weather which might have deterred younger and more vigorous men. He preferred the liturgy of the church of England to any other form of worship, and always kept by him an Episcopalian prayer-book.

Such indications as these are the more worthy of notice, because Mr. Jefferson is well known to have been a fearless and uncompromising man, paying small respect either to persons or what he considered prejudices. His worst enemies have never, I believe, charged him with hypocrisy, and his assertion of independence both in speech and action has often caused him to be misunderstood and misrepresented.

He was particularly sturdy on the subject of his religious belief, viewing with peculiar abhorrence all attempts to establish anything like an inquisition over the free thoughts of the mind, particularly on subjects which, far beyond human jurisdiction, lie between man and his God, to whom only he should be required to render his account. But to friendly inquiry and even admonition Mr. Jefferson was always open and gentle, and I have been pleased and surprised to see what different impressions from those which they brought good religious persons would often carry away, after long and frank converse with him on topics of which he equally with themselves admitted the importance, although perhaps his particular views might be different from their own.

With regard to Mr. Jefferson's belief in a future state, he has himself expressly declared it in more than one of his writings; but it is also a fact that the last words ever traced by his hands were an expression of the hope and expectation of rejoining the wife of his youth, whom he had never ceased to regret, and a daughter whose untimely death had robbed him of one staff of his old age, although he was blest with a surviving daughter whose devoted affection to himself he repaid by the most unbounded attachment.

Such, sir, are the best answers I can give to your questions addressed to me on the subject of my dear grandfather's opinions. But after all, the best answer to the accusations of his open enemies, and the more dangerous assertions of his pretended friends, is to be found in the whole tenour of a life passed in the exercise of every Christian virtue and devoted to the service of his fellow-men. A distinction which he liked to draw between the lessons of heathen philosophy and those of Jesus was, that the former had for their object to teach man to take care of his own happiness, whilst the latter turned his thoughts to the happiness of others. And if all were not happy who came within the sphere of Mr. Jefferson's influence, it was not for want of the most constant efforts on his part to make them so. In small things as in great the same ardent desire to do good formed the spring of all his actions. His kind offices beginning at home extended themselves in circles until they reached the utmost limits of his powers. At home he had been the best husband, and was the best father and grandfather, the kindest master, the most faithful and active friend, the most useful

neighbour. He was loved best always where best known. Those who approached him nearest were the most devoted in their affection and veneration, and it was only as men receded from him that they lost sight of his true proportions, which thus became distorted through the mists of prejudice and lost the symmetry which really belonged to them. I repeat again my firm belief that such a character as Mr. Jefferson's could have been formed under no other influences than those of the gospel; that there is in this world but one sort of tree capable of bearing such fruit.

I make no apology for these encomiums on so near a relation. Mr. Jefferson has ceased to belong exclusively to his family. He belongs to mankind, and we of his blood should consider ourselves as holding such information as our situation in regard to him enabled us to become possessed of in trust for those who ask it of us, and who, we believe, will make a worthy use of it. We speak as of one whom we love more than others can do, simply because we have known him better. Whatever light, therefore, this letter can throw upon the truth, as it regards a good and great man, is yours, sir, to make such use of as seems best to you; reserving only, as my own privilege, the right which belongs to every female, of avoiding public notice.

With sentiments of great respect,
I remain yours, &c.

Now, unbelievers, what will you do with all this mass of evidence? You cannot assert, with the least shadow of truth, that Mr. Jefferson ever uttered or published a syllable which contradicts a single sentiment I have quoted. No. All these opinions he did cordially embrace. All this is positive proof which cannot be refuted. But you can affirm that he has written some things which other Christians reject, and that he has spoken plainly concerning some parts of the Scriptures, Calvinism, the Orthodox clergy, and the apostles. All this I admit; but what does this prove? Because I have expressed my honest views respecting human systems of divinity, ambitious priests, or some things recorded in the Bible, am I therefore to be classed among unbelievers? This is surely a new mode of reasoning for infidels; and I will not charge this absurdity upon your system, until I find it stated in your publications.

You may also contend that Christians of different sects have called Mr. Jefferson an unbeliever. This I acknowledge; but what does this prove? Are you in the habit of taking the assertions of Orthodox believers in proof of any position which you reject? Why should you in this instance?

On what ground have they preferred this charge against him? Simply because he did not believe so much concerning Jesus and his religion as they did. Is this treating him according to gospel rules? Is this conduct consistent with the fundamental principles of Protestantism? I freely grant that my belief on several points of Christianity differs essentially from that of Mr. Jefferson. I do not know as he would agree in all particulars with any denomination in Christendom. But what of all this? Is not the Bible the common standard of divine truth? Has he not as much right to investigate as any other individual? Must I condemn one neighbour for believing too much and another for not believing enough? Am I the infallible pope? From whom have I received any such commission? No. I am bound by the gospel to do unto others as I would have others do unto me. I have no willingness to be called an infidel because I cannot assent to the creed of my Orthodox friend; neither have I any disposition to condemn Mr. Jefferson because he could not receive all the articles of my faith, so long as I know he wished to be regarded a follower of Jesus.

But the wrong-doing of Christians is no excuse for your misconduct. You profess to be governed by the principles of common honesty, I suppose. Now I demand to know upon what authority you claim Mr. Jefferson as an infidel. You have seen that he called himself a Christian, and wished to be so regarded by his fellow-men. You have seen that he endeavoured to regulate his life by the precepts of Jesus, and died in expectation of admission to the heaven which he revealed. You have seen that his family regard this charge of infidelity as a gross and shameless slander upon the character of their venerated relative. Can you consider your course honest, fair, just, right? I appeal to your common sense. I appeal to the community. Wherever this distinguished man is to be classed, he evidently does not belong to your party. I have no further interest in the question than to have the truth prevail, and if this be your object, as you loudly profess, you will no longer claim Thomas Jefferson as an infidel.

B. Whitman.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Social Evils and their Remedy. The Mechanic. By the Rev. Charles B. Taylor. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1834. 18mo. pp. 159.

That the Messrs. Harper should give to the public an American edition of this work is nothing strange; but that a clergyman should be its author is more than we can account for, without a supposition which we are unwilling to make. The clergyman who really understands and is prepared to fill his mission is the workingman's true friend. The gospel is emphatically the workingman's religion. They were "the common people who heard Jesus gladly"; and it was because "the poor had the gospel preached unto them" that John was instructed to infer that the Messiah had come. By "preaching the gospel to the poor," we are not to suppose was merely meant proclaiming to them its great truths, but that the gospel which contemplated the moral and social elevation of the poor, of the lower classes, was there proclaimed. This the gospel did contemplate, and insured it when it proclaimed the fraternity of the human race; and it is this which makes it a religion for the many, peculiarly good news to the millions.

The author of the book before us gives us no evidence that he has ever suspected this. He seems not to be aware that by virtue of his office he is bound to be the poor man's friend and the unshrinking advocate of the equal rights of all men. He sees a broad line of distinction between the higher and the lower classes of society, but he sees no evil in it. He sees evil only in the uneasiness of the lower class, in its efforts to equal or to exchange places with the higher. This book, coming as it does from a clergyman, would, if anything could, justify infidelity, and render indifference to religion a virtue. It breathes a spirit that would crush every effort of the people to meliorate their social condition. Its sentiments are worthy none but an antediluvian politician, such as none but a slave can embrace, or a tyrant wish to propagate. Its language is, "Vulgar Mechanics, to your places. Stand ready bitted and saddled for your masters' pleasure. Be brutes, as you are, and dream not that you are human beings." Such is the lesson with which it would cure social evils, and such the lesson its publishers would read to the liberty-loving workingmen of America!

With these remarks we dismiss this little production, but not the subject it professes to discuss. That subject is one not to be lightly dismissed by him who is conscious that there are duties which he owes to his fellow-beings. We fear, however, that too many do lightly dismiss it. We fear there are those who would brand such as believe that there are great and grievous social evils which demand redress, as agitators, demagogues, jacobins, or persons of desperate fortunes, who have nothing to lose but everything to gain by a change. We fear there are those, and even clergymen too, who, with their faces turned to the past, have no inward visions of a greater good for the human race, who dream not that as the professed disciples of Jesus they are bound to desire a progress, and to labour to set their fellow-beings forward in knowledge and virtue. We fear there are those who, because they find this world "a vale of tears" to the many, confounding the actual with the possible, infer that it always must be so, that God decreed it, and that it is impious not to be resigned to it. We fear; God grant that we fear without reason! We wish not to complain. But we would to God that all, and especially every clergyman, felt that the gospel was given to effect a great moral and social reform in man's earthly condition, that Jesus was a reformer, that the apostles were reformers, that he and they suffered martyrdom as reformers, and that whoever would be a true disciple of Jesus must love all men, even the most abandoned, well enough, if need be, to die as he did, upon the cross for their salvation; that every-one felt that he owes a vast debt to the community — a debt which cannot be paid so long as a single human being is deprived of his rights, a single vice remains to be corrected, a single new truth to be promulgated, or the least additional good to be obtained for any portion of our fellow-beings. We should feel this. It should sink deep into our hearts, and forbid us to desist from an earnest inquiry after a remedy for all social evils of whatever name or magnitude.

We say *remedy*. For we are not of that number who believe the evils of the social state are irremediable. We are not of that number who believe the earth is smitten with the malediction of Heaven, and that groans and tears are man's inevitable lot. We have seen suffering, we have heard complaints, we have seen and shared in man's miseries; but we never dared believe their cause was lodged in the bosom of the Divinity. We have seen the hand of God at work in the affairs of men; but we have seen it at work only for good. We have seen it pouring "oil and wine" into the wounded heart, binding up the broken spirit, and making the sufferer whole; but we have not seen it pushing man forward in a career of madness and compelling him to be "the greatest plague and tormentor of his kind." We have seen the factitious distinctions of society, and the tremendous evils they

involve, but we have seen in them no marks of the wisdom and goodness of God; we have seen in them only the foolishness and wickedness of man. "The foolishness of man perverteth his way, and his heart fretteth against the Lord." If these evils are the work of man they are not imperishable. If man has made them, man can unmake them. At least, it can be no disrespect to the Deity to labour to remove them.

But what is the remedy for our social evils? Who is able to answer? Not he who, contemning first principles and what he calls abstract science, applauds himself for being only a *practical* man; not he who denies all disinterestedness, and judging from his own heart, pronounces selfishness the governing principle of everyone's life; not he who is unconscious of the great duties involved in the spiritual brotherhood of the human race; not he who has to learn that his nature is allied to the Divinity and is susceptible of indefinite perfectibility; nor he who sees in the gospel no great social principle, which in its progressive developement must not only modify but recast society and place it upon an entirely new base. The remedy is in Christianity — in Christianity, not as a dogma, not as a system of belief, but as a grand, all-comprehending principle of moral and social action. It can be found only by carrying out into all the details of social and private life those great moral maxims which Jesus disclosed in his teaching and exemplified in his life. But how is this to be done? Not by saying, as it is said on either hand, It cannot be done; but by a full confidence that it can and *must* be done, and by engaging in earnest to do it. The pulpit alone cannot do it. *That* has spoken. Its voice, we trust, has alarmed many a one's conscience, arrested many a sinner in his mad career, called back many of the erring, and often consoled and confirmed the good; but alone it is too weak to check and roll back the full tide of depravity. It must be aided by Education.

Education! He who pronounces that word pronounces the remedy for the evils of man's social condition. But not he who speaks only of intellectual education. Many know their duty, but do it not. Many a man's understanding is right whose feelings are wrong. Man's *whole* nature must be educated. *Educated*, we say; by which we mean the right exercise, training, or disciplining of man's whole physical, intellectual, and moral nature. The body must be so educated as to insure it health, active and vigorous limbs; the feelings should be so disciplined that those which furnish the energy for useful and virtuous action may always be predominant; and the intellect should be so developed that the right and the best means of obtaining it shall always be obvious.

Education should have a religious foundation. Those who propose a system of education which excludes religion propose nothing really practicable or desirable. Aside from that part of

man's nature which finds its sphere of activity only in what pertains to religion, man is but an animal, or a mere creature of barren logic. In either case he ceases to be a human being who adds to his animal propensities and his reasoning powers those moral instincts which are the distinguishing characteristics and which constitute the real glory of human nature. All that is generous, touching, or sublime in our nature is intimately allied to the religious sentiment, and withers and disappears whenever that is struck with death. We would have all our systems of education recognise this truth. The great object of all our schools should be to reveal the mind to itself, to make the soul conscious of its lofty and deathless energies, and of its power to grow by an ever-enlarging virtue into the likeness of the Divinity. But in making religion the base of education, we should detach it from its various forms, disengage it from all its sectarian connexions, and present it simply as a sentiment of the heart, a law of the soul, as the great principle which is forever urging man forward towards higher and more advanced states of living. In school we would consider it as the principle of perfectibility, and occupy the young mind only with its spirit and results.

We know there are those who would exclude religion from our schools; but we believe it is only because they identify it with dogmas, and its instruction with sectarian strife and animosity. Did they view it as we do, they could not object to it. It does seem to us that no one not in love with depravity, no one who ever stops to gaze on an opening flower, to inhale its sweet perfume, or to catch the wild note of a forest songster, no one who feels the least emotion on beholding the distant mountains with harmonious outlines, the ocean where its "waves sleep on its bosom," or when the storm lashes them into fury, the deep blue vault of heaven lighted up with its thousands of evening fires, a generous sentiment, an act of heroism or of disinterested affection, can object to religion, which, as we view it, and as we would have it introduced into schools, is but the right exercise of our highest and most glorious faculties — neither more nor less than the perception of the beautiful and true, sympathy with the pure and spiritual, veneration for the holy, love for the good, gratitude for the munificent and the kind, and an eternal up-shooting of the soul towards perfection.

But however thorough, however religious, education may be made, the education of a few will not be enough. Egypt was the cradle of learning, of arts and sciences; but she has fallen. Greece was once the academy of the civilized world. Her philosophers sounded the depths of the human mind. Her poets and orators stand unrivalled. Her artists seized upon the idea of the beautiful, detached it, reëmbodied it, in forms which remain and will remain models through all coming time. But

Greece has fallen. Rome, once the haughty mistress of the world, was rich in statesmen, heroes, learned men, poets, and orators. But she has fallen, and comparative solitude reigns upon the "Seven hills" of her greatness. Why have all these fallen and veiled their glory in the dust? Not for the want of the educated few, but of the many — *for the want of an educated, enlightened population.* The lights which shot from the educated few were but flashes soon lost in the profound darkness which enveloped the mass of the people. The education of a few is not enough. The millions must be sent to school — not merely sent to school for two or three months in a year for half a dozen years, but must be educated in the fullest, broadest sense of the term. The whole population of a country and eventually of the world must be educated. This is the remedy for social evils, — education, moral, intellectual, and physical, based on religion, and universally diffused, and this, too, is a remedy which can be applied.

Can be applied. The stationary philosophers may contradict us. They may allege such a thing never has been, therefore never can be; that children are born with unequal capacities, and that it is folly to dream of making all equal; but they will not move us. We admit that children are born with different capacities, that education can never make all equal, but it does not follow from this that all cannot be educated. Education cannot create; we admit it can only unfold and aid the growth of the germs which nature originally wishes, but all except idiots have the genius and are susceptible of a spiritual as well as a physical growth. That all can reach the same size we do not pretend; but that all with proper culture can grow, will grow, is a truth we presume no one will controvert. Let this culture be given to all, let all have the means of attaining the largest growth of which they are susceptible; we ask no more.

To infer that all cannot be educated because all have not been is a species of logic long since superannuated. It is too late in the day to measure the future by the past. He who should wish to do it would have sided with the judges that condemned Socrates to drink the hemlock, would have joined the cry of the multitude in reference to Jesus, "Crucify him, Crucify him"; he would have recommended the burning of Huss and Jerome and Bruno, and the incarceration of Galileo; ridiculed Columbus for his new geographical notions, laughed at Franklin and his kite, and made sport of Fulton and his steamboat. Had this spirit prevailed, all those mighty discoveries and inventions which have given man his empire over nature would never have been made, or would have been stifled in their birth. The melioration of laws for which humanity now justly applauds herself, the improvements in the science of government which in our case have taken a rapid stride towards perfection, would

never have been effected, and instead of having the spectacle of a free people to contemplate, we should have had only masters and slaves. No. The past does not, cannot, in the sense in which the stationary philosopher alleges it, measure the future. There has been through all the past a progress, and this bids us look for still greater hereafter. If from the past it be allowable to predict the future, let it be from past improvements that we infer future ones.

We cannot dismiss this article without referring to the duty which one generation owes to another. The child must be "trained up in the way he should go," but he cannot train himself. The education, at least its rudiments, must be *given*. Parents, guardians, or legislators must provide for it. The existing generation must bestow it on the rising. The rank the generation to come after us will hold, the advances in civilization which it will make, depend almost entirely on the education we give it. How, then, does our duty to educate *all* the children of our country rise in importance! How do almost all other considerations dwindle into insignificance, compared with this! Who does not in this recognise an immense responsibility which rests upon him? Who would shrink from it, and not do his duty?

For ourselves we are glad that the duty of educating one generation is given to another. It prevents us from feeling that we stand alone. It is an arrangement which connects us with all the past and with the whole future. We are an epitome of the vices and follies, the virtues and intelligence of all past ages; and our action, good or bad, upon the generation to follow us, will be felt by the remotest posterity. We occupy a commanding position. No action can be without its result. No word can drop idly to the ground. A word, little heeded when spoken, may kindle up a virtuous energy in some bosom, which shall pass from that to another, from that to still another, till there be collected a moral force sufficient to shake the empire of evil and then to create an entire new order of things. Every man may, in consequence of this law of our social development, be contributing something to the knowledge and virtue and happiness of the most distant generations. No one is too low, no one is too obscure, to be able to aid forward the glorious work of moral and social improvement. No matter how few or how apparently isolated from the world may be the friends of humanity, their exertions can never be lost. Their most private acts may prove to be the highest public benefits; their most secret devotions may be nourishing principles, cherishing a force of character which will one day pass from them to some beyond their circle, to increase in power and activity till the whole world feel and own their influence.

This is the grand secret of all human improvement, the action of man upon man and of generation upon generation. This is the principle by which Jesus accomplishes the grand reform he commenced. It was by the action of man upon man, of generation upon generation, that the germ of moral and social perfection which he deposited in the earth was to be nurtured into life. The nation in which he appeared has passed away. The conquerors of his countrymen have been conquered, and their conquerors in their turn have passed under the yoke, but that germ remains. It has sprung up, received fresh beauty and verdure from every storm which has passed over it, and it has now risen to afford shade and shelter to nearly half the earth; but that it has survived the revolutions of ages and reached its present growth has been the result of no other principle. Man has imparted something to man, and one individual has kindled up the soul of another. One generation has accumulated something that its predecessor had not, which it has imparted to its successor to be still enlarged.

Let us not overlook this grand principle of reform, and so long as we have it in our power thus to aid in setting the human race forward in the march of improvement let us not be discouraged. We have in our hands the lever which moves the moral world. Let us learn to use it with effect. Let us feel the sublime power with which it invests every individual of the human family. This lever is education; and when we see the mighty power it holds what importance does it not receive! what attention does it not demand! Let all our thoughts be turned towards the means of making it thorough, religious, universal, and with the least possible delay. We are called to do this by every consideration which can arrest the understanding or touch the heart. We are called to it by all our love of human happiness, by all our aversion to pain, by all our desire to share in great and glorious actions. Whoever we are, whatever our party, sect, creed, or mode of worship, here is a field broad enough for us all, and in which we may all labour in peace. Fathers and mothers! Religionists and politicians! Clergymen and legislators! Patriots, philanthropists, and reformers! Here is the object equal to your gentlest affections and to your loftiest ambition. Lend it the concentrated powers of all your minds and hearts, of your whole souls. God grant ye may!

O. A. Brownson.

Manly Piety, in its Principles. By Robert Philip, of Maberly Chapel. New York, 1833. 18mo. pp. 218.

Mr. Philip is an Orthodox minister near London. He is publishing a series of "Guides" for young people. This is the first of the number. A preface has been obtained for this American edition from Rev. Albert Barnes, of Philadelphia, who some time since excited the odium of the Princeton school on account of his heresy, and who has more recently been known in this quarter by an able article on "Butler's Analogy," in the New-Haven Spectator. He assures us that he "should esteem it highly auspicious to the cause of pure and elevated piety, particularly among young men, if this book should receive a very extensive circulation." Why this opinion should have been expressed by this gentleman we could not divine until we reached the seventh essay. The book consists of eight essays on the following topics: Manly Estimates of both Worlds; Manly Estimates of True Wisdom; Manly Views of Salvation; Manly Faith in Providence; Manly Honesty in Prayer; Manly views of Divine Influence; Manly Views of Religious Mystery; Manly Views of Divine Holiness. In all these there is nothing very good or very bad; no great originality of thought or illustration; nothing very exciting or very improving; but much that is very well, quite clever, in our sense of the word.

But the seventh essay contains a direct attack upon Unitarianism. It is wholly devoted to this subject. By a very summary process he levels our system with the dust; that is, in his own estimation. Now that one whole chapter of this small volume should be devoted to this doctrine fully proves, in the first place, that in the neighbourhood of London this heresy was thought of sufficient importance to receive a laboured review; and in the second place, that in Philadelphia the danger of young men's being led astray by this faith exists to such a degree as to excite one of the most popular of the Orthodox preachers to aid the circulation of the book by his name and his pen. All this is well. We will now show our readers how skilfully this champion of mystery has demolished Unitarianism. Take the following specimen of calm reasoning, from the introduction:

"In a word, a religion without mystery must be a religion without a God; for the moment a God is admitted, mystery begins, and can never end. Unitarianism pretends, indeed, to be a religion without mysteries; and certainly it is not the fault of its votaries that any mystery cleaves to that system. They have done all that men could do to rid it of them; and somewhat more than even the devil ever ventured to try; for he did not venture to question the inspiration of the texts quoted against his proposals in the wilderness, nor to evade their force by analyzing their figures. But still, after all that has been

dared and done to rid Unitarianism of mystery, even the *oneness* of its God leaves him *incomprehensible;* and what more can Trinitarianism make him?" — pp. 161–2.

Our readers will perceive by this last question that our author is in no danger of being mistaken for a Solomon. We are told in Scripture that God is *one* person. This is a plain, simple proposition. This we can understand, comprehend, believe. But when we are told by the human creed that God exists in three distinct persons, that each one is God, that all are equal, that all are infinite in every perfection, and still that there are not three Gods, but only one God, we hear a contradictory assertion; we can neither understand, comprehend, nor believe. Now if Mr. Philip had desired to convince us that it is manly to believe mysteries, he should have shown us how we can believe a proposition to which no idea can be attached. Let us illustrate by an example. I solemnly declare in your presence this sentence, — "*Erbo di corece lavarco dclecou.*" I assure you that this contains a most important truth, and that it is absolutely essential to your salvation to believe it. You reply that you cannot understand it, that you cannot form any idea of the meaning of the words. Very well. I repeat the sentence and assure you that it contains a great mystery. Can you believe it any easier for its being called mysterious? Surely not. We are nowhere required to believe mysteries, because this is an utter impossibility, and this every man of sense ought to know. A revelation is the explanation of a secret or mystery. Our Saviour came to give us a revelation of the Divine will. We do not deny that there are mysteries in almost everything, but we do not believe them, for we cannot; it is a moral impossibility to believe without ideas. And we would further remark, that we do not receive the devil as our exemplar in quoting or applying or explaining passages of holy writ. We prefer the teachings of Jesus and his apostles. But we must hasten to the arguments. These are three in number.

1. The first is this: In heaven songs of praise are addressed to God and the Lamb. He then infers from this assertion that Unitarianism is false and Trinitarianism true. How this can be made out is beyond our feeble comprehension. But listen to Mr. Philip: "What, therefore, could a Unitarian do there, but either confess that he had never believed the Bible, or charge all heaven with idolatry and error? This would be in fact his only alternative. He could do nothing but acknowledge himself to have been a fool on earth, or impeach the whole 'general assembly' of saints and angels, as idolaters." — p. 167. Now we will answer this reasoning after his own manner. What could a Trinitarian do in this heaven? Can he hear one song ascending to Father, Son, and Spirit, as the eternal Jehovah? No;

not a single hallelujah of this description can be heard from one end of the celestial regions to the other; but all are praising God and the Lamb. Who is this God? Is it not the God and Father of Jesus? Is it not the infinite Jehovah? And who is this Lamb? The equal Son of God, one of the three persons in the Trinity, a being who is also God himself? Look to the book to which our author has referred, for an answer. We are there told that this Lamb was *slain;* that he redeemed us to *God* by his *blood;* that he overcame, and was *rewarded* with the highest honours, by having a seat on his Father's throne; and much more of the same import. And not a single instance can be found in which he is represented as Deity, or one of the three persons of the Godhead; and not a single passage can be quoted to show that the holy spirit was ever mentioned in this heavenly worship. This argument is peculiarly unfortunate for our author; for it proves that his own worship on earth is wholly unscriptural, and that the songs recorded in Revelation are strictly Unitarian. It proves, therefore, on his own ground that our doctrine is infinite truth.

2. His second argument is this: "The *mysterious* creed is the only form of Christianity which has ever been successful or sanctifying in our world." — p. 168. This assertion ought first to be proved in order to make the reasoning good for anything. But this important step is forgotten, and the whole proposition necessarily falls to the ground. He does, indeed, assert this for fact in repeated instances; and he declares that Trinitarianism has been the religion of the majority for many centuries. He then infers that God would not have permitted this state of things unless this had been the truth. Now this argument proves a great deal too much, and is therefore worse than nothing. Take a few illustrations. The heathen religion has always been embraced by a majority of the human family. Would this have been suffered unless the system were divine truth? Mohammedanism numbers more than Christianity. Would this have been permitted unless their sentiments were correct? The Catholics are the largest denomination of Christians. Would this have been allowed unless theirs were the true church? Mr. Philip's mode of reasoning wholly destroys his supposed argument. And this is too frequently the method adopted by our Orthodox brethren; they appeal to the majority of numbers to prove the truth of their system; while the majority at different periods of the church have been Unitarian in sentiment.

3. The third argument is this: "The manifest inconsistency between the *tenor* of Scripture and the *tenor* of Unitarianism. As my limits impose the utmost brevity, I must have recourse to a mode of illustration which will give *multum in parvo.*" — p. 181. Now what is this short cut? Why, Mr. Philip supposes after five hundred years the Unitarian doctrine to have be-

come dominant, and then that some minister of talents and influence addresses a circular to the Unitarian churches. He gives us a copy of what this letter ought to be. He has taken a few texts of Scripture from their connexion and applied them to Jesus. He then infers that no Unitarian could use the words of the Bible when speaking of Christ, and consequently the system must be false. Now this is the most unfortunate argument of the whole. It is at once annihilated by facts. Trinitarianism has been kept alive only by the constant use of human creeds. One of the great men in England would not circulate the Bible without the creed, because all the common people would become Unitarians if they read nothing but the Scriptures. Whole societies of Methodists and large numbers of the Baptists of that country embraced Unitarianism just so soon as they renounced allegiance to human creeds. In this country the Christian sect have established more than a thousand churches within thirty years, and all are Unitarian. How has this been done? Simply by giving up human creeds, and taking the Bible as the only standard of Divine truth. This always has been the result where the experiment has been tried; and this always will be the result so long as our Bible reads as it now stands. *Our* creed is the Bible, and we can express our peculiar sentiments in the very language of inspiration. This our *mysterious* believers cannot, or else they would not swear their theological professors and bind down their church-members to a human formulary of faith. We think, therefore, that Mr. Philip's pretended arguments are refuted.

B. Whitman.

The Christian Knowledge Society's Tracts.

The Christian Knowledge Society is, we believe, the richest institution of the kind in Great Britain. Its income for the year 1832 amounted to more than the enormous sum of seventy thousand pounds, or three hundred and twelve thousand dollars. It is connected with the Established Church, and its object is to circulate cheap publications on Christian doctrine, morals, and piety, and with a particular view to the conversion of Dissenters and the defence of the Establishment. In some late numbers of the Christian Observer (the organ of the evangelical party of the Church of England), there have been some severe animadversions on the character of many of the tracts which the Society has thought it proper to issue. The Observer talks of "the theology patronised by the Society," and tells us that many of its publications contain doctrines which are decidedly heretical, and that there is a growing dissatisfaction among a portion of its members on that account. It seems that the theology which is

the subject of these strictures does not recognise the doctrines of original depravity and of "faith alone," and has distinctly asserted that a holy life is necessary to a participation in the benefits of the atonement. It has also advanced some notions on the influence of the holy spirit, which do not appear to be satisfactory at all. We have none of the Society's publications, and of course cannot judge how far the strictures are true. Some of those which are pronounced heretical are written by distinguished clergymen of the Establishment, and we hope that they may be regarded as signs of the times. The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England are susceptible of such different interpretations, and it has been so difficult to learn the views of the great body of those who subscribe to them, that we are glad to see anything which looks like a definite expression of opinion from such respectable authorities as the writers of many of these tracts. We cannot tell to what extent the publications of the Society are an organ of the Church, but we judge that they must necessarily take their tone from the prevailing sentiments. J. Q. Day.

Works in Press.

A neat duodecimo volume of sermons has been selected from the manuscripts of the late Rev. Ezra S. Goodwin, of Sandwich, and a memoir written by the Rev. H. B. Goodwin of Concord. The work will be ready for delivery some time this month. Those who have heard this able divine preach will need no recommendation of ours. To those who are unacquainted with his writings we can most cordially recommend the forthcoming volume.

It must be highly gratifying to the friends of Liberal Christianity to learn that a large octavo volume of sermons by the late Dr. Parker, of Portsmouth, accompanied by a memoir from the gifted pen of Rev. Prof. H. Ware, Jr., is soon to be given to the public. As the profits arising from the sale of the work are to be appropriated to the education of his only child and son, we trust the number of subscribers for the work will be large.

Messrs. Manson, Emerson, and Grant, of Cambridge, are printing a duodecimo edition of King James's Bible. The text will be divided into paragraphs according to the sense, and the poetical parts will be arranged metrically. The duties of editorship devolve mainly upon the Rev. Mr. Coit, of the Episcopal church; and mentioning his name, we furnish a guarantee for the fidelity and accuracy of the edition. We hope the work will be liberally patronized, since we believe, from the specimens we have seen, it will be a very great improvement upon former editions. We learn that the Massachusetts Bible Society has passed a vote in approbation of the enterprise.

CORRESPONDENCE AND INTELLIGENCE.

INFIDEL MISSIONARIES.

It is probably known to many of our readers that Robert Taylor and Richard Carlisle have taken the name of "Infidel Missionaries," and for some years have been very industriously disseminating their demoralizing notions throughout England. They have been prosecuted and punished for their indecencies and blasphemies, and this inexpedient measure of some overzealous Christians has given them a notoriety and an influence with certain classes which they could not otherwise have secured. Several of their low, vile, scandalous works have been republished by the infidels in our own country, and are obtaining a somewhat extensive circulation among the uneducated and unprincipled, on whom they may produce the most injurious consequences. I requested, some months since, a distinguished gentleman in England to furnish me the means of estimating their true character, acquirements, influence, and success. From the answer to my letter I present the following extract, intending hereafter to give some further notice of these notorious individuals.

"Of the character of Taylor and Carlisle I will, if I can, enable you to judge by the documents I send. The first, however, I consider little better than a madman, and the second little better than a villain. If left unpersecuted they would both by this time have been nearly or quite extinct. As it is, they have neither learning nor character to influence any but the morally and physically lowest. For a long time their influence has been on the decrease. Unbelievers of good character and easy circumstances shun contact with them as with degradation. Among the morally low of the working classes they have an influence, and I am told that in a political respect Carlisle's influence has been extending. He has certainly been over the country on a mission of devilism — it is said, organizing the means of forcible resistance to the civil power, but I think he has more sense than to commit himself in any such plan. Carlisle was originally a tinker. Taylor was educated at Cambridge, and has more learning than sense. Both are bad men. Carlisle is a filthy sensualist. He is now living in what he calls, and recommends, 'a moral marriage,' that is, in adultery. They and their followers are wholly lost in delusion, deceit, and for the most part open sin."

LETTER FROM BUFFALO, NEW YORK.

"Buffalo is a place which contains persons of almost every variety of opinion, from the most exclusive bigot down to the confirmed skeptic. The predominant sect in this city is the Presbyterian. They have two meeting-houses, one of which is among the largest belonging to that denomination in the state. During the past winter *Burchardism*, as it is here called in common parlance, has filled the city with religious wildfire. Burchard, the author of the confusion, is well known here as the most prominent revivalist in this part of the country. Although he boasted of having made seven hundred converts, including two hundred children, as the fruits of his eight weeks' labour in Buffalo, yet it is said, that, after leaving here, he represented the inhabitants as the most incorrigible of all sinners. An indifference on the subject of religion is already, I believe, apprehended, if it is not now felt, in the very congregations in which his efforts produced the tremendous effervescence. This any reflecting person might naturally have supposed would follow as the fruits of such extravagance and folly.

"Besides a Catholic, a Calvinistic Baptist, and a Methodist Congregation, about which I have not particularly inquired, there is, in this city, a Unitarian and also a Restorationist society. The Unitarians, as you already know, own a neat and handsome house of worship, which was completed last fall, and dedicated by Mr. Pierpont of Boston. This society, though not large, is composed of members truly zealous and liberal, as well as highly respectable and intelligent. An English gentleman, of good talents and education, the Rev. W. S. Brown, has been administering to this society for the last eighteen months. He has, however, dissolved his connexion with this people and left here this week for the South, whither his family had repaired on account of ill health. Mr. Brown's society seem strongly and ardently attached to him. They, of course, parted with him reluctantly. The community speak of him in terms of high commendation. It was related to me that an individual was heard to say, a few days since, "Mr Brown is no doubt an excellent man"; to which another readily assented, adding, "But his principles"—meaning his Unitarian sentiments—"every body knows are very bad!" The Unitarians in this place are opposed strongly by a large portion of the inhabitants, but among themselves they are perfectly united. They are hoping and expecting, at no distant period, a clergyman from the East, to supply the place of Mr. Brown.

"The Restorationist society in this city have likewise a very convenient and elegant house of worship; but have not yet a settled pastor. It is stated here that considerable difference of sentiment exists in this society; that several who have connected themselves with it are believers in modern Universalism, and object to the settlement of a Restorationist minister. It is a matter of course that those who hold to the doctrine of the final restoration, and such as confine all the effects of sin to this mortal life, when united in society-relationship, find it extremely difficult to agree in a clergyman who can satisfy the wants of all. This fact, if nothing else, is, I think, producing a conviction on the public mind that a real and essential difference does exist between the opinions of these two classes of believers. Many members of the Restorationist society, of which I have spoken, are highly respectable for intelligence and moral worth."

We take the liberty of subjoining the following extract of a private letter from the Rev. Mr. Brown, in confirmation of the foregoing.

"It is yet the day of small things with us, and there are strong prejudices against us, limited very much, however, to the ladies. The intelligent men of the city are generally favourable, and have manifested their feelings more unreservedly of late, in consequence of a violent attack which was made upon us by Mr. Burchard, the revivalist clergyman. I challenged him to meet me and discuss the subject, and having received no reply, I delivered a few lectures in answer to his charges and (I was about to say) arguments, which were attended by large audiences; and I have reason to believe I succeeded in exciting a strong feeling in favour of our opinions and an increased determination on the part of the most respectable portion of the community to frown upon any further attempt to oppress and defraud us. The last remark will scarcely be intelligible until I have informed you that the chief object of the revivalist party in bringing Mr. Burchard here was understood to be '*to crush the Unitarians.*'"

EXTRACTS OF LETTERS FROM A MORMONITE.

A gentleman in this immediate vicinity early became affected with the Mormon delusion. His rank in life, his respectability, his education, his talents, his Christian character, were equal to those of the

majority of the Orthodox church to which he belonged. He removed his family to the West and joined the deluded multitude of fanatics who were collecting from all parts of the country. We have been favoured with the perusal of two long letters which he wrote last autumn to his aged father, and are permitted to take such extracts as may interest our readers. We present the following specimens, believing they will show very clearly the effects of error and fanaticism.

"*Independence, Missouri, December*, 1833.

"DEAR FATHER,

"THE village of Independence stands on the south bank of Missouri river; it contains thirty houses. One half a mile to the west there is a beautiful cultivated spot of one hundred and fifty acres. Notwithstanding the dark cloud which appears to hang over our heads at this time, on this spot of land will shortly be built the temple, and the city of the New Jerusalem, into which our Lord and Saviour will descend in a cloud from heaven with power and great glory. We have a plan given by revelation of the city and the temple. The temple is to be like Solomon's, only far more splendid. Many of our dear brethren, who have been driven from this land by our enemies, will shortly return in the Lord's due time, and help to accomplish this great and glorious work. I have sufficient authority for saying this, for the Lord hath spoken it.

"The inhabitants of Jackson county are mostly emigrants from Kentucky and Tennessee. They are generally an indolent and illiterate people. They have been very friendly to us till within six months. They are mostly enemies to the cause of Christ. This county is ruled by about twenty-five rich and designing men from the Southern States, who are mostly engaged in trafficking amongst the Indians. The leaders of this body are about half a dozen of those who receive pay from government and your missionary society. Yea, there was Mr. M., the Baptist missionary to the Indians, who was the leader of a mob of thirty-two who fell upon us in November, and sware in their wrath that they would slay us, if we were not off in twenty-four hours. So the Lord suffers the lofty-minded hypocrite to show out the evil of his heart, that his condemnation may be just. These great men all had a hand in pulling down our printing-office. Great was the waste of property. Thousands of bushels of grain were trodden under feet. Houses were destroyed. Through the mercy of God we all have abundance to subsist on yet. The price of wheat is fifty cents, corn twelve and a half cents, per bushel; beef and pork two and a half to three dollars per hundred.

"You wished to know how we spend the Sabbath. We mean to spend it as the Lord has commanded us by revelation. We are strictly forbidden to do any other work on the Lord's day but to prepare our food, and to assemble ourselves together to worship the Lord. We commence our service with prayer. Then it is the duty of every member, both old and young, to arise, one at a time, and speak of the goodness of God, and to confess our sins, if we have committed any the past week, to one another and before the Lord. This is frequently done in an unknown tongue, and then interpreted by one who may have the spirit for this work. Here is the wisdom of the Lord to search out all iniquity; for many of us have been moved by the Spirit and spoke in another tongue that which, when interpreted, would prove to be the secrets of the heart and sinful deeds that we should not confess in our own tongues. Many a one has risen with tears in his eyes, and confessed the truth of the interpretation. Furthermore, in obedience to the commands of the Lord, we on every Sabbath commemorate the death and sufferings of our Lord and Saviour, by partaking of the bread and wine, yea, pure wine, the clear juice of the grape. Our branch made one barrel this fall.

"We have had many trying scenes to pass through since we arrived here

one year ago. The Lord spake by revelation that he was not well pleased with his children in Zion, and that we all had great need of repentance, pointing out our greatest sins, which were, breaking the law of the celestial kingdom, and not reading the book of Mormon. Again we received the word of the Lord in June by revelation through the prophet in Kirtland, that we had much iniquity amongst us, that he would not have his holy land polluted, and that there was a scourge and a judgment awaiting the inhabitants of Zion. Accordingly our chastisements were very severe. Many were cut off from the church from that time. For several weeks we received great blessings from the Lord. The most of the church that stood received the gift of tongues, to speak in the language of the Lemanites as well as in those of the isles of the sea and the nations of Ur. It was given to some in each branch of the church to interpret all that was spoken; and also it was given to many of us to prophesy of things shortly to take place. James lived with me last summer; he bids fair to make a holy child; he can speak in as many as twenty-five different tongues."

LETTER FROM BERKSHIRE COUNTY.

DEAR SIR,

I HAVE received the first two numbers of "The Unitarian" and am much pleased with them. A work of this kind was greatly needed, and I doubt not will effect great good. What we want in such a work is a manifestation of strong, practical good sense; a thorough sifting of all religious extravagance and intolerance; an honest, straight-forward pursuit of truth; a vigorous crusade against the system of imposition by which modern revivals are "got up," carried forward, and consummated. We wish to be taught that religion is not, like our Sunday vestments, to be merely put on upon certain occasions, and then put off again; but that it should be worn through the whole week and at all times; that its manifestations should be seen in our sobriety, our temperance, our honesty, our charity, our industry, and in the cheerful performance of *all* our duties, as men, and citizens. Is it unsafe to teach that social service is religious service?

It seems to me that the modern revival system lies at the foundation of the difficulty; for how few persons, after joining themselves to Orthodox churches, feel an inclination to pursue any inquiry which may tend to weaken their faith in the dogmas of their church! I think, however, we have much to hope from the dissensions going on between the two Orthodox parties. They exhibit conclusive evidence of the purifying and holy tendency of the exclusively *evangelical* creeds. The excessive tenderness and delicacy exhibited towards each other finds its counterpart only in the gentle buffetings which both unite in bestowing on the contemptible Unitarians. In Berkshire we have no Unitarian societies; but in many Orthodox societies with which I am acquainted I know there are many persons of respectability and intelligence who avow themselves Unitarians, and many others who are ready to accept almost any system in preference to the present. What can they do? Shall they break loose from the mass, and voluntarily set themselves apart for martyrdom? The revivals have come along periodically and swept their wives, their children, and their friends into the church. It matters not how unexceptionable the character of these men may be, they are prayed for as "impenitent," "ungodly," "workers of iniquity," "opposers of God and religion." It is true that names are not often called in public, but descriptions are given which point the *offenders* out so clearly that the congregation, great and small, are at no great loss. The old clergymen in general, much to their credit, are raising a feeble opposition to the new measures, but they find zealous

advocates of those measures among the fanatical and fiery spirits of their own churches at times, and the young clergy of the New-Haven school are generally supposed to be advocates of the system.

Young females and children compose a majority of the subjects or *victims* of the revivals in this neighbourhood. Young females, from an excess of zeal, have frequently overstepped the modesty of nature, and solicited interviews with the other sex, for the purpose of aiding in their conversion. As the father of a somewhat numerous family I dread the prevalence of all such extravagance and fanaticism as will have a tendency to produce in my daughters a disregard to the delicate proprieties of life, as well as that over excitement of the nervous system which unhinges the mind and prepares them to become inmates of the insane hospitals, as many hundreds have been.

THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSION IN BOSTON.

Boston, April 4, 1834.

My Dear Sir,

Your favour of the 1st inst. was duly and gratefully received. You request me to give my opinion of the recent discussion in this city between Messrs. A. Ballou and D. D. Smith, upon the subject of future retribution. This I freely and cheerfully give; the more so, because the opinion of the parties has been freely expressed, in which I perceive both claim the honour of a victory. This I did not expect; for I supposed that the manifest and positive success of Mr. Ballou, in sustaining the affirmative of the question, would not be contested by the most ardent friends of Ultra-Universalism; especially as Mr. Smith failed to show that the proof-texts of Mr. Ballou might not and did not mean what he asserted and proved they did. It is true, Mr. Smith boldly asserted that the texts had no reference to a future state; but in applying them to the present state of existence he was under the necessity of giving explanations, which, to say the least, were not very rational.

I present one example. Mr. Ballou adduced the following text in support of future retribution, from 2 Tim. iv. 6–8. "*For I am now ready to be offered,*" &c. In reply, Mr. Smith contended that the passage had no reference to a future state, but to this only. Paul had been a faithful servant of Jesus Christ, was now about to suffer martyrdom, and leave a *name* by which, in all future ages of the church, he would be crowned, as a faithful apostle and minister of Jesus Christ, with a *Crown of Fame!!!* Therefore the passage did not prove that men would be rewarded in the next life for the deeds done in this. Mr. Ballou contended that there was a crown laid up for Paul, "and not for him *only*, but for *all* who loved the Lord's appearing;" — that "the Lord, the righteous judge" — not the church on earth — would "give it at that day."

I consider the above expositions fair specimens of those given by the gentlemen in the course of the debate. I give Mr. Smith great credit for his ingenuity in the management of his cause, but must say his expositions of the Scriptures sometimes astonished me; e. g. Paul's *crown of fame*, — the resurrection of the just, — the second death, — the last days, — the end of the world. A cause that requires such expositions of the word of God to sustain it, I am fully satisfied, can never be the cause of truth.

I therefore give the preference to Mr. Ballou. He used no management or sophistry, his expositions were clear and rational, and it appeared to me they were "mighty in pulling down the strong holds," and in giving the cause of truth a glorious triumph. A report of the debate is to be published soon, to which I appeal for the correctness of my opinion.

Yours, with respect,

Joshua V. Himes.